

REPORT / RECOMMENDATION



To: MAYOR AND COUNCIL

Agenda Item #: IV.E.

From: Wayne D. Houle, PE, Director of Engineering

Action ☒

Discussion ☐

Date: December 11, 2012

Information ☐

Subject: Public Hearing – Normandale Neighborhood Roadway Improvements No. BA-394,
Resolution No. 2012-152

Action Requested:

If the Council determines the project to be necessary, cost-effective, and feasible, Council shall adopt Resolution No. 2012-152 accepting the feasibility study and approving Normandale Neighborhood Roadway Reconstruction, No. BA-394, authorize plans and specifications to be completed and bids taken.

Information / Background:

City staff initiated this project. The project involves water and sewer service pipe reconstruction, rehabilitation of the trunk sanitary sewer, upgrades to the storm sewer system, upgrades to water system such as replacement of gate valves and fire hydrants, curb and gutter spot repair, reconstruction of bituminous pavement and a potential multi-use path.

The overall project cost is estimated at \$3,553,000, which includes City owned utility repairs and replacement. Funding for the roadway cost will be from a special assessment of 100% of the roadway cost. All City owned utility repairs will be from the respective utility funds. The multi-use path would be funded by the Active Living Infrastructure Fund (ALIF).

The Park Board commented on the alignment of the multi-use path at the November 19, 2012 Park Board meeting. The draft meeting minutes are attached. No additional correspondence was received since the feasibility study was submitted to the Council.

Staff has analyzed the project and feels that the project is necessary, cost-effective, and feasible from an engineering standpoint.

Attachments:

November 19, 2012 Park Board Meeting Minutes

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
November 19, 2012
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Jones called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm and welcomed Mr. Keprios back.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Dan Peterson, Hulbert, Cella, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Segreto

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Hulbert, Cella, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Segreto

Motion Carried

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto approving the consent agenda as follows:

IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board Meeting of Tuesday, October 9, 2012

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Hulbert, Cella, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Segreto

Motion Carried

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. Edina Nordic Ski Snowmaking Proposal

Andy Turnbull, 5437 Halifax Lane, informed the Park Board he is the head coach of the Edina Nordic Cross Country Ski Team. Paul Gage, 5813 Amy Drive, informed the Park Board he is the assistant coach of the Edina Nordic Ski Team. The two coaches gave a power point presentation regarding their snowmaking proposal and indicated what they are asking for from the City is the use of water and a compressor.

Member Dan Peterson asked if the request up to a million gallons of water is per snowmaking session or for the whole season to which Mr. Turnbull replied hopefully for the whole season.

Member Hulbert stated that he really likes the idea and asked if they are successful this winter would they try to raise money to purchase a compressor for use in the following years to which Mr. Gage replied that their next most likely option would be to look into leasing. He explained that these compressors are used to blow out people's sprinkling systems and then they collect dust until the next year.

Member Cella asked her understanding from the presentation that the loop that is being proposed to be made this year is entirely on park land rather than school land. Mr. Turnbull replied there might be one

small edge that drops onto school land but probably 90% of it is on park land. She noted in the written proposals it states you have a tentative agreement from the Creek Valley administration and asked if they are any further with that. Mr. Turnbull replied to the best of his knowledge they have been given tentative approval and he has not heard anything to the contrary.

Mr. Keprios commented that he thinks the Park Board should view this as a partnership rather than just a request from the Nordic Ski Team. He noted from a staff standpoint they find it very beneficial to the general public and it would be wonderful to have a cross country groomed trail we can count on through the winter. However, they do have questions about using water to make snow for a sledding hill primarily for liability purposes and would like to just do the trail for the pilot project and not a sledding hill. Mr. Turnbull replied they would be happy to not take on the extra work.

Member Gieseke stated he likes the idea and it's beneficial to the community as well as the school so he is behind it. He noted it is a pilot project and maybe a year from now they can take a look at how successful it was. He commented that he knows there is a storehouse of used equipment and it may help the community be able to participate more if they could offer some kind of rental or something and get some of the younger kids started because that may help the team later on. Mr. Turnbull also suggested there are certainly some community education options for giving lessons if they have snow.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if they looked at putting the trail at the high school because it would be a more convenient and easier location especially for the younger students. Mr. Turnbull replied they have but because it's within walking distance and it's a sport they felt a little extra activity is not going to hurt them. He explained the primary reason they looked at the Creek Valley venue was because the hills at the high school are too steep to be skiable and they didn't want to put that kind of liability on anybody. In addition, Creek Valley has a little greater hydrant access.

Member Kathryn Peterson commented that it looks like the extended loop actually infringes somewhat on the soccer fields and is concerned that having the track go through there might damage the field and therefore they will want to make sure that the corner is off of the field and there isn't a loop that goes over the field. Mr. Turnbull replied they are certainly cognizant of keeping the fields in good shape and in the past when they have had to snow groom those fields they have had pretty good success and in the spring there is no visible sign they were ever there but that is a point well taken.

Member Jacobson stated it sounds like a good idea and asked how long they anticipate it will take to make that much snow and what time of day would it be made. Mr. Turnbull replied they are hoping it can be done in a week but it is weather dependent and obviously it gets colder at night. He pointed out that if they blow from the area between Creek Valley and the Crosstown, where they are pretty isolated from any residential interference, they may try to do that during evening hours to the extent that they comply with the noise ordinance and they are aware they can't keep anyone up at night.

Member Segreto stated she likes the proposal and is familiar with the trail as it goes from 9 Mile Creek up towards the water tower and although it's not a steep incline it is an incline and during the non-snow season she is wondering about the stability of the trail so that they don't get a lot of erosion on that incline. Mr. Turnbull replied the trail that they have been using is in place and this is the third year for most of it and so far it has been very stable and added that they have tried to grade it so that the run off is controlled. He noted that this spring they may try to get something onto parts of those trails whether it's grass seed or some sort of wood chips but at least to this point it has been a pretty stable trail. Member Segreto wondered because there will be more use there will there be less underbrush there because she is starting to see a little wear because she does use that trail quite a bit and doesn't know whose expense trail stabilization would be. Mr. Turnbull responded they have done all of the work on it to this point and again when they cut that trail they tried to grade it so that erosion would not be a concern; however, there is not much they can do to keep people off it but it is their intent to come back and do some

seeding and/or put down woodchips. Member Segreto asked if they are tracking for classic skiing and ski skating to which Mr. Turnbull replied yes.

Member Segreto asked during drought years what is their water policy issue for non-essential watering? Mr. Keprios replied they did ask the City Engineer that and were told the demand for water is significantly lower in the winter so it's not an issue.

Member Segreto noted that she recalls at a prior meeting they passed a resolution allowing a snowmobile to track on parkland and asked if approval will be needed to use the snowmobile on the Creek Valley property. Mr. Turnbull replied they have the blessing of the school administration to use that as well as the school administration is very much behind them on this pilot project.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, to accept the proposal as written with the exception of the sledding hill.

Mr. Keprios pointed out the request for a permit for the noise ordinance is not something the Parks and Recreation Department grants and wants to clarify that is not part of the motion but is something the Health Department would be responsible for because they will have to keep the decibel levels within acceptable levels which do vary from day to night.

Member Segreto asked if they need to be concerned about any insurance issues to which Mr. Keprios replied whatever insurance issues there are they are well covered through their general liability.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Hulbert, Cella, Deeds, Jones, Gieseke, Kathryn Peterson, Jacobson, Segreto
Motion carried.

B. 2013-2017 Parks and Recreation Department Capital Improvement Plan

Mr. Keprios commented that unfortunately he thinks Parks and Recreation general parks ended up on the short end of the stick; however, the good news is they are getting the lion's share of the Construction Fund money available for the parks in that more of it has been funneled to the enterprise facilities. He noted that he thinks it will self-correct in time but that for the short-term they are going to be hurting a little in the general parks but once they are able to find adequate funding they will be able to play the catch-up game.

Member Deeds stated they know they are short on playing fields and lack the space for their demand and younger kids trying to play all of the growing sports and asked why all of the athletic fields were listed at a 5 or below. He asked what the feedback in terms of the high ratings was and what was getting funded in contrast with the 1, 2 and 3 priorities. Mr. Keprios replied that being absent for the last two months this was a shock to him and he is not prepared to answer what exactly happened. He noted that he agrees he was more than disappointed to see what he thinks are some of the higher priorities. He stated he thinks it's really a culmination of some of the point values that were given and being that they are now competing with all of the departments within the City.

Member Deeds asked if there is any appeal process or is this written in stone for a two-year cycle because he would love to find out what the priorities are and asked if it would be possible to bring the City Manager in to discuss it. Mr. Keprios replied he does not know whether or not there is an appeal process but believes the City Council will be paying close attention to the Park Board's review and comments. He indicated that he thinks it is their intention to act on this CIP but if there are really strong feelings from the Park Board that this is not acceptable they may decide to delay the process and maybe have a joint meeting but that is for the City Council to decide.

Member Hulbert stated clearly there are some needs in the park system that maybe cannot simply be addressed in a CIP and after having gone through the sports dome process there are some short-term, intermediate term and long-term issues that need to be addressed. He suggested maybe there might be an opportunity in the upcoming year to have a work session with the City Council to discuss some goals and address some of the needs in the park system.

Ms. Kattreh pointed out that the items ranked with priorities 1 thru 5 are likely to be funded in the first two years and items that are ranked a 6 or 7 are not likely to be funded in the first two years. She informed the Park Board that she did have an opportunity to make an appeal to the City Manager and was told if, for example, there were a project for \$250,000 that we would like to put back into the process then we would need to come up where we would cut \$250,000 because we only have a limited amount of resources available. She noted that she did make an effort to specifically get the Pamela fields back in the process and did come up with some fairly significant cuts primarily from the enterprise operations; however, it was decided to keep the proposal as is for the time being.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked for clarification that those given a priority 5 were likely to be funded but commentary from staff indicates that the only thing that actually was funded for 2013 is the Wooddale Park Playground equipment. She stated that, for example, the Garden Park baseball field, which was another partnership project, appears to have fallen by the wayside and that questions were raised at the last meeting regarding the priority of the equipment at Wooddale Park. She pointed out that Wooddale Park does not need replacing at this time and there are probably greater needs both in terms of playground equipment and possibly using those funds for another project. Mr. Keprios replied that the Garden Park baseball field is in fact scheduled and budgeted to be done in the year 2013 for \$300,000 but that is relying on a minimum of \$200,000 from grants and donations. He stated that the bad news is they have been informed that they did not receive the grant; however, the EBA has come forward and asked if they continue to use the City's \$100,000 and they will donate \$100,000 and see how much they can get done in 2013 for \$200,000. He noted that is something that will be on the table but it is budgeted for 2013. Also, the playground equipment replacement at Wooddale Park is the only thing other than the equipment and replacement for the Parks Department currently on the 2014 plan and that's relying on a \$100,000 donation from the neighborhood.

Member Jones indicated there are currently 23 playgrounds in Edina and most playground manufacturers say they have a life span between 15 and 20 years. She noted the oldest playground in Edina is Lewis Park and it was installed in 1995 and that the playground equipment at Wooddale Park was installed five years later. In addition, there are 12 playgrounds that are at least five years older than the equipment at Wooddale Park. She pointed out she is having a hard time with the tight budget rationalizing \$100,000 to have one park skip over all of these other neighborhood parks and if someone were to ask them why they are doing that she would have a hard time rationalizing it. She noted she thinks in their capital improvement budget they need to be replacing at least one playground every year to maximize both staff and the planning process as well as the actual installation process. She asked what the plan will be because even in the five-year plan they don't have that. Mr. Keprios replied yes, the reason it is on the 2014 budget is because a resident has come forward and offered to raise \$100,000. He stated that he agrees they need to put play equipment in once a year to be sure they catch up. He noted that in 1996 they had a successful referendum and replaced a lot of them at one time and it's going to be difficult to do that all in one year and so it should be put on a schedule and get to them one at a time.

Member Hulbert asked at what level does a bonding issue need to go to a referendum to which Mr. Keprios replied that is up to the City Council, there is no magic number. He noted he thinks when the City Council gets to a point where the needs are so great and the funding is not available and they don't think they can raise a levy politically that they will go to the voters. He commented that as he stated in his staff report he thinks it would be wise of the City Council to find a more sustainable fund to catch up on the needs that the Park Board has astutely brought forward, the playground equipment, all of the field issues and find a sustainable source of funding so you don't have to go to the voters to do maintenance.

Member Hulbert indicated that a few years ago they talked about putting in turf at Pamela Park and that the life expectancy of this field is 12 years and when they compare the costs of a grass field versus a turf field you compare the annual maintenance expenses of the grass fields to the upfront costs of the turf field it's not like they are adding something to the system that is going to require ongoing maintenance. He noted that is why he is wondering on a bonding issue if they clearly have a need for more multi-use athletic fields what would the appetite be with City Council to do something like that. Also, if the debt at Fred Richards is retiring this upcoming year it may be worthwhile to have a work session or a discussion with the City Council to see what their appetite is for doing something like that for the upcoming year. Mr. Keprios responded that he was told that the City Council has already brought up some discussion about a bond issue and are thinking in that direction and it would be a great discussion for a work session with the Park Board and City Council. He stated that is correct the golf course bond indebtedness goes off the books in January; however, they still have about one million in cash deficit that the City would like to have paid back. That is going to take time; however, they are still willing to make some investments back in the golf course but maybe a referendum is the direction to go because he doesn't know how else they are going to catch up.

Member Cella asked within the projects that are listed did parks staff have the ability to move some items to a priority 5 and others to a priority 7 for items we are not going to fund immediately, could staff reorder the priorities within the rankings of 5, 6 and 7 or was that also out of your hands. Mr. Keprios replied once it had gone through the new process parks staff had no say as to the point value. Ms. Kattreh commented they were able to rank their projects for the Parks Department which there were approximately 80. Member Deeds asked do these correlate with that ranking or are they not terribly correlated. Ms. Kattreh replied that's a difficult question to answer because the capital improvement funding for the enterprises is very generous and so in terms of the enterprise facilities they did very well; however, their general parks projects did not do quite as well.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that what staff recommended to administration at the start of this process, Attachment B, is just slightly different from what the Park Board supported a year ago, Attachment C. He noted the major difference is they decided it made more sense to build a new field before they renovate the senior fields and that way they won't have a loss of a field for a season.

Member Jones asked where the ½ size basketball court for Highlands Park came from to which Mr. Keprios replied that is not a new one; he has had that request from residents in the neighborhood for several years but never in a formal petition manner. He noted that another resident came forward saying they will get a petition together if that's what it takes and although it was a little late for that he did put it on the CIP just to see where it goes. He added it's not a lot of money and even so it didn't make the list.

Member Jones commented her vision for neighborhood parks is to create community so maybe this neighborhood wants a basketball court and maybe they don't, but there are processes the Park Board has done such as with Chowen Park they invited the neighborhood to get together and ask them what playground equipment they wanted and what they wanted their park to look like. She stated that she would be more comfortable approving this after that process than before that process by having one person come forward saying they want this. She added at their neighborhood meeting they did not even mention this so the neighborhood doesn't even know about it and therefore feels before they move ahead with something they should vent that.

Mr. Keprios indicated that he thinks that falls within the same category as the Lake Edina Pathway where all of a sudden it's on their agenda and there has not been a public process for that and if they survive the funding process his intention was to do a public process. He noted maybe there is some argument to be made that we spend the money and time and does the neighborhood really want this and should they have put this in the proposed CIP. He pointed out that Lake Edina will not necessarily happen even if the funding gets approved if it doesn't survive the public process. They've already spent

some money on an engineer to go out and map out where the path is going to be and how much it's going to cost and after that they are going to have a public process if it survives funding. He would think the basketball court would be much the same if the neighbors really end up not wanting it they won't go forward.

Member Jones stated she thinks every neighborhood should have the ability to look at their park comprehensively and not just say do you want a trail but what do you want it to look like. She indicated she is uncomfortable leaving that on there just as she is uncomfortable leaving on the equipment for Wooddale Park although she does want to encourage neighborhoods to say they will do fundraising and that type of cooperation with the Park Board in order to make their parks as beautiful as possible.

Member Deeds commented he understands the idea of getting neighborhoods to raise money and have fundraisers; however, he is slowly concerned with the priorities they are setting because it is biased towards upper socioeconomic neighborhoods versus lower socioeconomic neighborhoods. Some neighborhoods can tap on a neighbor's door and find \$100 per neighbor very quickly while others cannot. He stated it's not just that they are fundraising to their park but they are providing City matching dollars based on essentially a neighborhood ability to raise funds which is biased towards higher socioeconomic neighborhoods. He commented it's one thing if the neighborhood is raising all of it but if you start matching you are siphoning money to the upper income levels which he is very concerned about in the long run in setting that kind of precedence. Mr. Deeds stated he agrees, he finds that Wooddale Park is the only approved piece essentially troubling and he understands the pragmatism of it but the community should be taking care of all of its parks and the priorities should not be based upon the income level of the people surrounding those parks and the priority they are setting is factoring that income level. He indicated this a priority they need to think about because they do have economic disparity and they have a fairly decent and potentially an increasing distribution within this community and they need to begin thinking through that and the City Council had better start thinking through that. Member Jones stated she couldn't agree more.

Member Jones stated she would like to draw attention to the age of the other shelter buildings that are not mentioned in the CIP. Normandale and Arden Park are mentioned in the CIP and were built in 1974; however, the Creek Valley building was built in 1968 and Pamela Park was built in 1970. She commented it seems as if they are jumping over some parks for shelter buildings and that may be okay because maybe some of those communities don't want a shelter building and maybe they would rather have a gazebo but she would like to bring that discussion into it. Mr. Keprios replied that is an excellent point and those are things that need to be looked at as they begin to prioritize the replacement of the older infrastructure.

Member Cella asked if there is a master list showing all of the warming houses and other buildings that details which are in the worst shape, which need the most maintenance so that they can be prioritized because an older building could be in much better shape and need much less renovation in which case you wouldn't be replacing that before the younger building. Mr. Keprios replied unfortunately there is a very healthy and long list of future capital improvement plan projects and replacement of shelter buildings is one of them. He noted that he did put this list in front of the Park Board last year and yes they have given it a lot of thought and have put it on a five-year plan for the money they thought would be available but the funding just isn't there. He added there is a whole list of future capital things that maybe could be considered for a referendum.

Member Jones asked about the Utley Park bathroom renovation and commented she didn't even know there were bathrooms at Utley Park. Mr. Keprios replied it is one of the oldest buildings in the system and is not handicapped accessible. He commented that hopefully they will raise enough money to build the Veteran's Memorial because then there will be an even greater need for handicapped accessible restrooms at Utley Park. Mr. Keprios explained back when the building was built it was used strictly for the well and pumps that are inside the building and mainly used by the Utility Department and so they

needed to build restrooms for staff because there were offices in there and just decided to make them accessible from the outside so the public can use them too. He added it was never a park building but was really more the Utility Department that built it. Member Jones asked is it a park building now to which Mr. Keprios replied no, they never built it, designed it and really had nothing to do with it. The Utility Department came and just put it in there and now it needs to be upgraded and Utilities is willing to help to try to fund some of that. Member Jones commented that maybe they wait until the memorial is funded and then renovate it.

Member Deeds indicated in his estimation having spent the last year looking at their athletic field needs this is a very disappointing outcome and a very short sighted outcome. He noted the fact of the matter is where the athletic fields are placed when they build them will be used by kids citywide; they are not just for the neighborhood. He added when Edina is compared to other suburbs to which they compete for families moving in and out and deciding where to live such as Minnetonka, Wayzata, Eden Prairie, etc., they aren't even in the ballgame relative to the facilities their neighboring competing communities have. He stated in the long run it is an extremely short sighted decision in terms of not funding any new fields whatsoever and he honestly believes the City Council should reconsider what is going on.

Member Segreto noted that she shares in the frustration with this plan as it has come to them today and thinks it's a blueprint to see our parks deteriorate. She stated they do not have the money they need to take care of the parks; therefore, just absent a bond referendum she doesn't know where the money is going to come from to do what they need to do.

Member Kathryn Peterson commented that she would like to express again that going through this process has been very frustrating for all of them to come in at the very tail end of it when things appear to largely be decided. She stated she thinks that is something that needs to be looked at for next year in terms of the sequence of the steps because she is not sure they have very much input at this point.

Member Cella commented when it is presented to the Park Board for review and comment the process has already been done and there is no room for appeal. She stated if they are saying this is what it is then what review and comment does the Park Board make other than we don't like it and we don't agree.

Member Jones reiterated her frustration with not only the sports fields but she would ask that the City Council get a copy of the "Proragis Report" from the National Parks because it shows where Edina ranks as benchmarked against other communities across the country. It shows they are short on fields and thinks they should really pay attention to that. She also stated if they aren't going to go to a referendum for additional money for the parks then they can't waste time, they need to come up with a plan for revitalizing the neighborhood parks and that should be part of this five-year plan.

Member Gieseke stated as he listens to everyone here he is not sure if there is a person here that doesn't think it's probably high time that we take a serious look along with the City Council. We are an advisory board and he thinks they can advise City Council that it's high time in looking at their CIP and their needs that they do not match today and they do not match in five years. He stated it's high time they take a serious look at a bonding referendum situation and maybe have a joint meeting and move from there. He noted this is a prescription to move backwards and not even to maintain and it's highly unacceptable.

C. West Shore Drive Pathway Expansion Proposal

Mr. Keprios showed the Park Board two options regarding the West Shore Drive Pathway Expansion proposal. He noted Wayne Houle, City Engineer, has asked for the Park Board's review and comment on the proposed plan of bringing a bicycle trail through the neighborhood between 66th Street and 64th Street on the west end of Rosland Park.

Mr. Keprios pointed out the thing that struck him was do they really need 18 feet of asphalt for the amount of pedestrian and bicycle traffic they get, especially when you consider the entire length of the approved Nine Mile Creek Trail is only 10 feet wide and that is to accommodate both. He stated in his view this is too wide and too great an impact on nature on the path. He noted he thinks it's a wonderful idea to bring it in and make it more bicycle friendly, he just doesn't think they need to have 18 feet of asphalt on that small section.

Member Dan Peterson stated that he supports what Mr. Keprios said.

Member Hulbert stated he also supports what Mr. Keprios said and was curious if the Transportation Commission has weighed in on this yet. Mr. Keprios responded he doesn't know that it has been brought to them yet. Member Hulbert noted that he leans more towards the first option and thinks whenever you bring pedestrians and bicycles together on the same path you could have some safety concerns and also agrees with that being really wide for a pathway through the woods.

Member Cella asked what the current width of the pathway is through the woods to which it was noted 8 feet.

Member Deeds indicated the issues regarding run-off and everything else when you put in a width of 18 feet of asphalt in the middle and the impact on wetlands and streams and everything else it does not seem to be appropriate. To him option A as originally proposed seems to make the most sense.

Member Jones first thanked the City Council and Transportation Commission for including bike paths which was one of things that came out of the "Attitude and Interest Survey". The residents were really in favor to improve our bike paths and trails and getting people from this neighborhood to the north as well as she thinks this would tie into the pedestrian bridge. In addition, this would be a path that could continue on and tie into the Nine Mile Creek trail so it would be a way to get north-south traffic. She commented if she were to design it she would put a path next to the walking path and around the lake where it would get a whole lot of use because where it is currently located it hits 64th Street and it seems as if it's going out of the way. Therefore, she would put it next to the walking path and curve it around and tie it into the pedestrian bridge and would really love to be able to have a bike path around the lake separated from the walking path. She stated between the two options she would go with Option A.

Member Gieseke commented he lives in this neighborhood and often runs along that path and it's a no outlet type of situation so he is perplexed as to why they need this whatsoever. He is all in favor of the bike path but the traffic along West Shore Drive moving that direction towards Crosstown is almost non-existent and the road is narrow so somehow he would prefer the bikes to move along that roadway as opposed to spending the additional dollars. He stated it's a beautiful area right through there and to him it might detract from the appearance of what they have going on right now. If you do have bikes moving through a separate path it would probably make some sense because if you look around the Minneapolis Lakes it's hard to mix people walking their dogs on leashes and bikes and at different speeds that adds some element of danger there and so he doesn't see a whole lot that he likes with either option.

Member Kathryn Peterson stated she is curious as to how this budget is being funded; everything from the engineering drawings to the actual path clearing the brush all of that stuff to which Mr. Keprios replied he does not have that answer. Member Kathryn Peterson noted that she thinks there might be things on their list that they could put ahead of the path.

Member Jacobson noted that she agrees about the width; her only comment is she likes Option A because she prefers separation between bikes and people like Lake Harriet or Lake Calhoun keeping them separate is important.

Member Segreto commented that the environmental impact of Option B is just too severe so if she had to support one of the plans it would be Option A but she sort of agrees she does not understand how this fits in with the whole bike system, she would need further study but that is not what she is being asked.

Mr. Keprios stated one thing he forgot to mention is he thinks Option A is probably considered a sidewalk and according to current ordinance bicycles are not allowed on sidewalks so maybe they have already got that part ironed out or are assuming they will change the ordinance to permit that. Mr. Keprios suggested maybe they consider an Option C which is to not have a sidewalk per se but just make a 10 ft. wide path stretch from 64th to 66th Street and make it just one path similar to what the Nine Mile Regional Trail is going to be.

Member Cella asked if the two block stretch ties into the greater Edina bike path in some way to get from certain points in Edina because it dead ends up against Crosstown and doesn't see how it can really be any part of a master plan of biking around the City. She stated that it seems to be a lot of expense and work for a two block stretch of bike trail. Mr. Keprios replied he doesn't know if it's for them to debate the wisdom of the transportation plan, but yes, that is correct.

D. 2013 Parks and Recreation Department Fees and Charges

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board there are not a whole lot of changes on their general parks and recreation fees. He explained as staff they try to keep it at a break even basis and if they don't get enough registrants at those dollar amounts knowing their expenses then they will drop the class. He commented that he thinks the fees are set fairly affordable and reasonable and cover the expenses. He pointed out they did have an increase in Men's Basketball and the only real significant change is the increase at Arneson Acres to basically recover some of their expenses. He added that it is a pretty high demand park and also gives preference to residents as the non-resident fee is a little more than the resident.

Member Gieseke asked generally speaking how they differentiate the fees between residents and non-residents and is there a strategy behind it. Mr. Keprios replied when they feel that the demand for the residents is so great that residents are otherwise going to be denied access to the better times they will limit or completely eliminate access for non-residents. When that's not the case they open the door to non-residents like they do at the pool and golf course. He added with the general parks they don't allow any non-residents to reserve any of their athletic fields because it's difficult just to keep them in a pristine condition that they need to be for Edina teams.

Member Hulbert asked if Rosland Park see more requests for rentals than any of the other parks for large charity events and walks. Mr. Keprios replied the one they get the most requests for is Rosland Park Pathway and to run fundraisers and again they only rent those out to residents. Member Hulbert commented that he is not trying to find ways to gouge charities but the one thing that it does do is when you have events like that it takes the whole park almost offline for the neighborhood. He asked is \$225 a day and \$75 an hour kind of the going rate and what does the City of Minneapolis charge when they do something around Lake Calhoun. Mr. Keprios replied again, that would only be for residents and the fee does cover the maintenance expenses.

Member Jacobson indicated in looking at the picnic shelter rental cost for a half day or full day they seem pretty low and fairly cheap compared to the City of Minneapolis. For example, looking at Sherwood Park for a half day is \$28 which thinks is really, really cheap. Mr. Keprios replied that Sherwood Park is just a little picnic shelter to which Member Jacobson responded it's in her backyard and that it is still a picnic shelter and can host an event for anyone. She stated if you are looking at the City of Minneapolis for a small picnic shelter the rate per hour is much higher. Mr. Keprios asked how many people the shelters would accommodate to which she replied she is thinking of a variety of different parks. Mr. Keprios stated Sherwood accommodates 8 to 10 at the most comfortably.

Member Jones indicated that she went on-line and looked at the General Fund for the City of Edina because they are only seeing this one piece which is revenues they never really see the whole pie and so it's hard for her to say these are fine. She stated that it looks to her as if the most recent budget listed is from 2011 and 2010 and it looks as though they have a variance of under budget of approximately \$300,000 for both 2011 and 2010. She noted she is trying to figure out if the City Council has budgeted them 3.8 million but they only use 3.5 million with all of the needs to keep the parks well maintained are we charging enough. She commented that according to this maybe they are overcharging or maybe they are not using the money that has been allocated to them. Mr. Keprios explained they spent \$333,000 less than what they actually had budgeted; however, that amount has nothing to do with revenues. He noted that he thinks the bigger question is why we didn't spend all of the money we were budgeted for and for that they need to dig a little deeper into where are the areas that we are actually very frugal and didn't spend those monies because those are not capital dollars but are operating dollars. Member Jones asked what happens to that money to which Mr. Keprios explained with any overages the City Council decides at the end of each year, it was over one million dollars last year, and they decided to put a big part of it into funding capital improvements. Mr. Keprios pointed out they should not be budgeting in a way that you are going to rely on this because that is not what you call a sustainable source of income. He noted it doesn't matter what you charge in fees that number all has to do with what expenses we are expecting as well as what kind of a year we had as far as a drought, heavy rains, maintenance, vandalism, etc. There are many factors that can affect that and a lot of it is we were just down right frugal and so it really has nothing to do with where the fees are set.

Member Kathryn Peterson stated it's not really clear to her how much some of this stuff costs so some things seem very reasonably priced and some of the playground activities and Senior Center items seem very cheap. She noted she is not sure how much is being subsidized by the City so that would be a piece of information that would be really helpful. Mr. Keprios replied if he recalls correctly the Park Board is going to have a working group study with the Senior Center which he believes former Park Board member Bill Lough had asked to be a part of. He noted the Park Board should put that on their work plan and if you would like more information next year for the fees and charges on the expense side staff can prepare that.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

None

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

None

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that as he stated earlier they did not get the Hennepin Youth Sports Grant to renovate the Garden Park baseball field; however, with the Council's approval they would like to go forward and use the \$100,000 that is budgeted for that project. It could be matched with EBA's \$100,000 donation in 2013 to significantly renovate the baseball field.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that the decorative lights at Walnut Ridge Park are up because the neighborhood was able to raise the money.

Ms. Kattreh gave the Park Board an update on the sports dome. She informed them she will be taking Park Board's recommendation to the City Council tomorrow night which states "The continued study of Braemar and the forward motion of the dome should not occur until the issue of expanded playing fields is addressed, solved and budgeted for". She noted that along those lines she has been working with the EFA, ELA and ESC on trying to figure out a way they can reallocate field space to try to make Braemar field an option for the dome. She indicated they may have come up with a good temporary field solution and that is moving football in the fall to the new artificial turf at Braemar, if they were to build a dome, and then moving fall soccer to the Lewis Park fields where football currently is. She

explained this would give soccer extra field space and football would get the turf they are looking for. She noted it would give soccer the ability to possibly run two fields width wise on the very westerly Lewis Field and it appears to be a win/win for all of the associations involved. She commented that the ESC is very interested and excited about this proposal and football and lacrosse are very interested as well. In addition, this would also give them possibly the ability to take the rested field and put it back into play at Lewis because the primary reason for resting a field at Lewis right now is because the football use on that field really tears it up; therefore, if football is off of those fields and onto an artificial turf field they would be able to put that field back in play for soccer. She commented right now all of the associations involved are very interested and excited about this proposal so it at least gives them a temporary solution to the loss of field space if they turf the Braemar Athletic field.

Member Deeds asked if they are signing off on this to which Ms. Kattreh replied they have not had an opportunity to meet with their boards to give them an official letter so isn't a firm written deal. However, she has received verbal assurance from the associations, especially soccer. Member Cella thanked Ms. Kattreh for all of the hard work and negotiating to salvage something and make it work for everyone, she appreciates that.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board they have hired Brian Recker from RJM to be the construction manager for the Golf Dome and Brian is putting together what it is going to cost the City to replace the Golf Dome in its preferred design. He noted that the administrative building will be separated from the dome and not directly attached to it so that the dome itself is not pulling on the roof. They are getting close to a settlement but he thinks it's pretty clear they are not going to get as much money as they need to replace it with the desired design. There are a lot of new and costly building code requirements; however, the insurance company will pay for that up to a limit.

Member Jones asked to be filled in on the Arena. Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board they did have a major mechanical failure in the West Arena and they are still trying to determine the exact cause of that failure. She noted they did have a corrosive environment in one of their chillers that caused the solution to actually rust through some of their tubes in the chiller; however, they were able to isolate and repair those tubes on the chiller and they did get the ice back up and operational in time to get the hockey season off to a good start. She indicated they are still trying to get to the bottom of the cause of the chemical imbalance but they are back up and running; unfortunately, it took over a week to make the repair and then another week to put the ice back in. Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board the Hornet's Nest is two weeks past the day they were hoping to open so now they are shooting for December 15th.

Member Dan Peterson asked for an update on the Veteran's Memorial. Mr. Keprios replied unfortunately in his absence recovering from surgery not much happened but since he has been back they now have someone who will be taking over the fundraising effort. He noted they are back on track and if you look at their website there is now a thermometer that shows how much money they've raised and they are currently at approximately \$130,000 out of the \$450,000 that needs to be raised and he thinks they are going to get there.

Member Deeds stated that he thinks they ought to recognize that Coach Bowman and EHS had a heck of a football season; EFA built some pretty good players through the program using City fields and commented that they also beat Eden Prairie on Homecoming. Member Cella pointed out that they also beat Hopkins and Wayzata on their homecomings.

Member Gieseke stated the Edina Girls Tennis Team set a national record of 16 State Championships in a row.

Meeting adjourned at 8:48 pm